

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

**Plaintiff,**

Case No.: 3:16-CR-00062-RCJ-VPC

vs.

## ORDER

AL CHRISTOPHER BRAXTON ALLEN,

**Defendant.**

Defendant has filed a notice indicating that he desires to appear unshackled at upcoming hearings. (ECF #27). Defendant bases his notice on the majority opinion of an en banc panel of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, which recently opined 6–5 that final defendant has a Fifth Amendment right to appear in court unshackled unless an individualized examination indicates that physical restraints are the least restrictive means of serving a compelling government interest, i.e., courtroom security. *See United States v. Lopez-Gomez*, 2017 WL 2346995, at \*13 (9th Cir. May 31, 2017) (en banc). The Government moved to strike the notice. (ECF #28).

The Court begins by noting that the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure make no provision for “notices,” such as the one Defendant has filed here. Accordingly, the Court could simply strike the notice from the record, as requested by the Government, without taking further action on it. Construing the notice as a motion, however, the Court will refer it to the Magistrate

1 Judge assigned to this case. It is the Magistrate Judge who, in the first instance, considers the  
2 need for security measures with respect to individual criminal defendants, e.g., by determining  
3 whether a defendant poses a risk of flight or danger to the community. Therefore, the Magistrate  
4 Judge is better situated to determine whether to grant Defendant's request, after consulting with  
5 the U.S. Probation Office and the U.S. Marshal, and considering, *inter alia*, Defendant's prior  
6 criminal history, jail discipline history, and any relevant facts to which Defendant has allocuted.<sup>1</sup>

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Motion to Strike (ECF No. 28) is DENIED.

9 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Notice (ECF No. 27) is REFERRED to the  
10 Magistrate Judge for a ruling under Criminal Rule 59(a).

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that in the future the Clerk shall automatically refer such  
12 motions or "notices" to the respective Magistrate Judges in all of the undersigned's cases, with  
13 reference to the present order.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED dated this 15<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2017.

15  
16  
17   
ROBERT C. JONES  
United States District Judge

19

---

20 1 With some irony, the Court notes that the majority opinion in *Sanchez-Gomez* is almost  
21 entirely dicta, and yet to reach its conclusion the majority acknowledged it was required to  
22 disregard the dicta of the Supreme Court. See, e.g., *Sanchez-Gomez*, 2017 WL 2346995, at \*11  
23 (citing *Deck v. Missouri*, 544 U.S. 622, 626 (2005)). Of course, the only essential part of the  
24 majority's opinion is found in its last paragraph, wherein the court denied the petitioners' request  
for a writ of mandamus. See *id.* at \*13. It cannot be said that the shackling policy at issue was  
unconstitutional if the ultimate holding of the court was to deny mandamus relief to the  
petitioners. Furthermore, the denial of a petition for writ of mandamus ordinarily does not even  
become law of the case, see *Kirshner v. Uniden Corp. of Am.*, 842 F.2d 1074, 1078–79 (9th Cir.  
1988), much less binding precedent in other unrelated actions.